INITIAL STUDY
AND
MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

HUNTINGTON STATE BEACH

EXPAND LIFEGUARD HEADQUARTERS AND TRAINING FACILITY

PUBLIC USE IMPROVEMENTS

September 2004

Prepared for the California State Parks
Orange Coast District

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

PROJECT: **HUNTINGTON STATE BEACH EXPAND LIFEGUARD HEADQUARTERS AND TRAINING FACILITY**

LEAD AGENCY: California State Parks

AVAILABILITY OF DOCUMENTS: The Initial Study for this Mitigated Negative Declaration is available for review at:

Southern Service Center
California State Parks
8885 Rio San Diego Drive, # 270
San Diego, California 92108

Orange Coast District
California State Parks
3030 Avenida del Presidente
San Clemente, CA 92672

Huntington Beach Public Library
7111 Talbert Ave.
Huntington Beach, CA 92648

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
The project proposes to expand, reconfigure and make necessary facility improvements to the existing Huntington State Beach Lifeguard Headquarters and Training Facility. The project will entail a partial demolition of the existing structure, and addition of new building areas. The 'island' the building sits within will also be enlarged approximately 18 feet to the north into the existing parking lot. An enlarged structure comprised of one and two story areas will be constructed, with an observation tower of equal height to the existing tower. The proposed project will increase the size of the facility from about 5,000 square feet to approximately 10,550 square feet. The project will also provide for landscaping around the building and ultimately the removal of storage containers and office trailer located in the parking lot. The new facility will provide lifeguard office space, storage space, first aid treatment area, locker rooms and larger training room. Underground utility work will also be a part of this project. The existing building has complete utility services and the intent is to reuse the existing utilities, however some amount of trenching will be required to make necessary connections with new lines from the building. The design of the new facility will be structured around the guidelines for sustainable design. The LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) checklist will be used to provide guidance in design decisions regarding site design, water efficiency, energy and atmosphere design, reuse of materials and resources, indoor environmental quality, and for innovation and design processes.

A copy of the Initial Study is attached. Questions or comments regarding this Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration may be addressed to:

Brenda McMillan
California State Parks
Southern Service Center
8885 Rio San Diego Drive, Suite 270
San Diego, California 92108
Phone: (619) 220-5300
Fax: (619) 220-5400
enviro@parks.ca.gov

Pursuant to Section 21082.1 of the California Environmental Quality Act, California State Parks (CSP) has independently reviewed and analyzed the Initial Study and Negative Declaration for the proposed project and finds that these documents reflect the independent judgment of CSP. CSP, as lead agency, also confirms that the project mitigation measures detailed in these documents are feasible and will be implemented as stated in the Negative Declaration.

TABLE of CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 INTRODUCTION AND REGULATORY GUIDANCE

The Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) has been prepared by the California State Parks (CSP) to evaluate the potential environmental effects of the proposed "Expand Lifeguard Headquarters and Training Facility" project at Huntington State Beach in Orange County, California. This document has been prepared in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), Public Resources Code §21000 *et seq*., and the State CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations (CCR) §15000 *et seq*. The project is funded in its entirety through the State of California's Major Capital Outlay Program.

An Initial Study is conducted by a lead agency to determine if a project may have a significant effect on the environment [CEQA Guidelines §15063(a)]. If there is substantial evidence that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) must be prepared, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15064(a). However, if the lead agency determines that revisions in the project plans or proposals (made by or agreed to) mitigate the potentially significant effects to a less-than-significant level, a Mitigated Negative Declaration may be prepared instead of an EIR [CEQA Guidelines §15070(b)]. The lead agency prepares a written statement describing the reasons a proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment and, therefore, why an EIR need not be prepared. The IS/MND conforms to the content requirements under CEQA Guidelines §15071.

1.2 LEAD AGENCY

The lead agency is the public agency with primary approval authority over the proposed project. In accordance with CEQA Guidelines §15051(b) (1), "the lead agency will normally be an agency with general governmental powers, such as a city or county, rather than an agency with a single or limited purpose." The lead agency for the proposed project is CSP. The contact person for the lead agency is:

1.3 PURPOSE AND DOCUMENT ORGANIZATION

The purpose of this document is to evaluate the potential environmental effects of the proposed Expand Lifeguard Headquarters and Training Facility project at Huntington State Beach (HSB). Mitigation measures have also been incorporated into the project to eliminate any potentially significant impacts or reduce them to a less-than-significant level.

This document is organized as follows:

Chapter 1 - Introduction.
This chapter provides an introduction to the project and describes the purpose and organization of this document.

Chapter 2 - Project Description.
This chapter describes the reasons for the project, scope of the project, and project objectives.

Chapter 3 - Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures.
This chapter identifies the significance of potential environmental impacts, explains the environmental setting for each environmental issue, and evaluates the potential impacts identified in the CEQA Environmental (Initial Study) Checklist. Mitigation measures are incorporated, where appropriate, to reduce potentially significant impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Chapter 4 - Mandatory Findings of Significance
This chapter identifies and summarizes the overall significance of any potential impacts to natural and cultural resources, cumulative impacts, and impact to humans, as identified in the Initial Study.

Chapter 5 – Project Alternatives
This chapter summarizes the alternatives considered for the Huntington State Beach Lifeguard Headquarters and Training Facility project.

Chapter 6 - Summary of Mitigation Measures.
This chapter summarizes the mitigation measures incorporated into the project as a result of the Initial Study.

Chapter 7 – References/Document Preparation.
This chapter identifies the references and sources used in the preparation of this IS/MND. It also provides a list of those involved in the preparation of this document.

1.4 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Chapter 3 of this document contains the Environmental (Initial Study) Checklist that identifies the potential environmental impacts (by environmental issue) and a brief discussion of each impact resulting from implementation of the proposed project.

Based on the IS and supporting environmental analysis provided in this document, the proposed Huntington State Beach Expand Lifeguard Headquarters and Training Facility project will result in less-than-significant impacts for the following issues: aesthetics, agricultural resources, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land

use and planning, mineral resources, noise, population and housing, public services, recreation, transportation/traffic, and utilities and service systems.

In accordance with §15064(f) of the CEQA Guidelines, a MND shall be prepared if the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment after the inclusion of mitigation measures in the project. Based on the available project information and the environmental analysis presented in this document, there is no substantial evidence that, after the incorporation of mitigation measures, the proposed project will have a significant effect on the environment. It is proposed that a Mitigated Negative Declaration be adopted in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines.

THIS PAGE LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK

CHAPTER 2
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This IS/MND evaluates the environmental effects of the proposed Huntington State Beach Expand Lifeguard Headquarters and Training Facility project. The project proposes to expand, reconfigure and make necessary facility improvements to the existing 5,000 square foot lifeguard headquarters, training facility and tower building. Upon completion the new facility will be comprised of a combination of renovated existing spaces and new construction totaling approximately 10,550 square feet. The new construction will include an enlargement of the one story structure as well adding a two story component. The construction will also replace the existing observation tower with a new tower of equal height. The new facility will address program requirements for the park operations and the training facility; office space, storage, first aid treatment, locker rooms, and the training facility.

2.2 PROJECT LOCATION

Huntington State Beach is a designated unit of the State Park system. It encompasses approximately 100 acres and is approximately 2.3 acres in length. Huntington State Beach is one of the most popular state beaches in southern California. It offers excellent ocean and beach recreational opportunities such as surfing, swimming, and fishing, bird watching, skating and cycling. The state beach is located in the County of Orange and lies between Bolsa Chica State Beach and the City of Huntington Beach Municipal Beach. Nearby communities include Costa Mesa to the east, Fountain Valley to the north, Seal Beach to the northwest and Newport Beach to the southeast.

2.3 EXISTING FACILITIES AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT

The existing Lifeguard Training Facility and Lifeguard Headquarters was built in 1984, and is located within the park just north of the Magnolia Street entrance. The existing facility is approximately 5,000 square feet and houses the Huntington State Beach park operations and the statewide lifeguard training program as well as many other training seminars. The facility provides spaces for park operations including a public contact location, lifeguard dispatch, staff offices, locker rooms, storage areas and a garage/shop. The facility also has a training room for mandated as well as other training programs. Office space and storage containers for the training program are currently located in the parking lot just north of the existing building.

The facility is used by both the park's staff (lifeguards, maintenance staff, visitor service park aids, and technical services) as well as the seasonal lifeguard training program. The park staff is responsible for the upkeep and maintenance of the park, its resources and its

facilities as well as providing for the safety of park visitors. The lifeguard training program provides training to seasonal ocean lifeguards for the entire state and is also host to a number of other training seminars including aquatic safety seminars, regional human resources training, regional computer training as well as personal watercraft training. Occasionally departmental exam and interview panels as well as other state and community organization also use the facility.

From the time the facility was constructed, Huntington State Beach and the entire State Park system has experienced increased visitation. In response, the training programs have been expanded and the number of staff operating out of the facility has increased to meet the changing needs of California State Parks, the park and the public. On peak summer day's as many as 130 to 140 staff people per day use the facility. The existing structure is no longer able to adequately meet the current space requirements of the facility's many users.

The primary concern regarding this facility is the need for additional space for both the base operations of the park as well as the training programs. The quality of training provided to the lifeguards as well as the ability for park staff to efficiently carry out their work, both directly impact the public's safety as well as the quality of service the park is able to deliver to the public. The current training room is not large enough to accommodate the number of trainees required to be in each session. The crowded training sessions compromise the effectiveness of the training program. In addition to the problems associated with the training room, the current layout and inadequate space create much inefficiency in daily operations due to the different user groups attempting to use the same small workspaces. In order to ensure a quality training environment for lifeguards and adequate space for the park staff to conduct effective daily operations the facility requires an expansion and remodel so that these various functions can effectively and efficiently co-exist.

A secondary concern addressed by this project is the current level of wear and deterioration of the existing structure and the need for renovation of the facility. The coastal environment is extremely hard on buildings and this building though well built and maintained is showing signs of deterioration and wear.

Upon the completion of this project, Huntington State Beach will have a fully operational facility specifically suited to accommodate the needs of the various users of the facility. This improved facility will ensure that California State Parks meets its goals to provide for public safety and a quality recreation experience at Huntington State Beach as well as the many other state parks that depend on this facility to train their lifeguards.

2.4 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The purpose of this project is to make improvements to the lifeguard headquarters day-to-day operations and improved training facilities for beach lifeguards. Beach lifeguards require unique training in order to incorporate both the water safety and law enforcement aspects of their profession. Project features would provide:

- Improved office and work areas for park operations.
- Improved meeting and training facility with adequate storage and support space to be completely housed within the facility.
- Lifeguard observation tower.
- Female and male locker room facilities.
- A first aid treatment area with storage.
- A garage and storage area for maintenance and lifeguard operations.

The proposed project, as outlined above, will further the Department's mission by:

- Improving the quality of life in California by increasing the diversity and availability of high quality recreational experiences and opportunities.
- Providing and maintaining a supportive infrastructure for continued park use and maintenance, and the protection of park resources.
- Providing a safe environment within State Parks.

2.5 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

CSP proposes to make several improvements to the lifeguard headquarters and training facility at HSB. A portion of the existing building will be demolished and an addition of one and two story spaces will be added. The existing tower will also be replaced as part of this project. The project will require the expansion of the island the building sits on by approximately 18 feet to north into the parking lot. The following is a summary of the planned improvements:

The expanded facility will provide for the following program requirements:

Park Operation Office Space & Support	Approx. 2530 S.F.
Training Rooms & Support	Approx. 2220 S.F.
Lifeguard Observation	Approx. 190 S.F.
Locker rooms	Approx. 980 S.F.
First Aid Treatment & Support	Approx. 235 SF
Garage and Secured Vehicle Storage	Approx. 2680 S.F.
Circulation & Building Equipment	Approx. 1715 S.F.
Total Building Program Requirements	Approx. 10,550 S.F.

The expanded facility will also provide approximately 1,500 S.F. of secured parking for state vehicles. Temporary accommodations for base operations may take parking spaces outside the area outlined in the construction footprint (Exhibit 1), however there will be a net increase the number of available parking spaces at the end of construction.

2.5.1 Provide Additional Park Operation Office Space

The enlarged office and support areas will allow for heavy operational use during business hours and will allow park operations to function independently of the training facility. These spaces will accommodate lifeguards, lifeguard supervisors, seasonal lifeguards, support staff, maintenance staff, visitor service park aids, and technical services. These areas will include offices, work stations, a small meeting room, restrooms, a copy area, a lunchroom, and a secured storage area for law enforcement and safety equipment.

2.5.2 Provide Training Room and Support Facilities

The renovated training room will be provided which will be able to accommodate a greater number of trainees per session; the existing room can only hold 28-30 trainees per class. The new training room will be able to hold up to 50 persons. The training room will provide a state of the art, quality training environment for lifeguards. Multi media capability will allow for other benefits like video conferencing. This area will be used for statewide lifeguard training, aquatic safety seminars, regional human resources training, regional computer training as well as personal watercraft training. Adequate storage for the training equipment and materials will be provided as well as an office space for the training program staff. Restroom facilities for the training room will be provided which will also be the public restrooms for the building. The training facility will also accommodate the other potential users including departmental exam and interview panels as well as other state and community organizations.

2.5.3 Provide Lifeguard Observation Tower

The lifeguard observation tower will be located to have the best vantage point and visibility of the waterfront. The observation tower will be the same height as the existing tower and will have enough space for two people.

2.5.4 Provide Female and Male Locker Rooms

Separate female and male ADA locker rooms with restrooms shall be provided for the park staff. These locker rooms will be secure and independent from the training facility.

2.5.5 Provide First Aid Treatment Area with Storage

This area will be used to treat first aid emergencies and will be used to store medications and other consumables.

2.5.6 Renovate and Expand Garage and Secure Vehicle Storage

The garages will accommodate up to 3-4 state Code 3 vehicles, ventilated storage areas for gear, paddle board trailer, personal water craft, and other multi-purpose uses. The garage areas will also provide adequate space for maintenance equipment and tool storage.

2.5.7 Provide Circulation and Building Equipment

The circulation spaces will provide for movement around the building and will also provide access controls between the different user groups of the building. The building mechanical spaces will provide space for the equipment the building requires.

2.6 PROJECT CONSTRUCTION

The construction window for this project will be from October 2005 through May October 2006. Improvements will be limited to those areas that were disturbed in the past or are otherwise devoid of sensitive natural, cultural and historical resources. All work will occur during daylight hours. Temporary accommodations for base operations will be provided for

the duration of construction and may take parking spaces outside the area outlines in the construction footprint (Exhibit 1). Temporary storage space will be provided for the duration of construction for existing furnishings and equipment that will be reused when the improvements to the facility are complete. Due to the sensitive nature of all coastal areas, storm water treatment best management practices (BMPs) will be incorporated into the project during construction. BMPs will include the prevention of construction materials and pollutants, such as concrete wash, from entering the ocean as well as other erosion control methods as necessary during construction.

2.7 ATTENDANCE HISTORY

Park attendance records for 2001 and 2002 indicate that 3,661,980 people visited HSB each year.

2.8 CONSISTENCY WITH LOCAL PLANS AND POLICIES

The project provides for improved service and safety for the HSB. This project is consistent with local plans and policies because it is expanding an existing lifeguard facility. The City of Huntington Beach currently has a Local Coastal Plan as part of the their General Plan

2.9 DISCRETIONARY APPROVALS

CSP has approval authority for the proposed “Expand Lifeguard Headquarters and Training Facility” project at HSB. A Local Coastal Development Permit will be obtained from the City of Huntington Beach.

2.10 RELATED PROJECTS

CSP often has other projects and/or maintenance programs planned for a park unit. . No other additional work, other than regular maintenance, is currently in progress or planned for this area.

CHAPTER 3
ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING

3.1 GENERAL ENVIRONMENTAL DESCRIPTION

HSB is a designated unit of the State Parks system and consists of approximately 78 acres (2.3 miles) of flat sandy beach extending from Beach Blvd. south to the Santa Ana River on the Newport Beach boundary. HSB is located in the County of Orange (Figure 1, Appendix A).

3.1.1 Aesthetics

The principal aesthetic resource at HSB is the scenic quality of the flat sandy beach and panoramic perspective of the Pacific Ocean from the entire unit.

3.1.2 Agricultural Resources

Currently there are no agricultural resources within the boundaries of the HSB.

3.1.3 Air Quality

The closest air quality monitoring station to the project site is located in the City of Costa Mesa. Measurements taken at the Costa Mesa station exceeded the 1-hour federal standard for ozone one time and state standards one time for the year 2000. The 8-hour state standard for ozone was exceeded one time that same year. The major pollution sources in the region are automobile and truck exhaust and local industrial plants.

3.1.4 Biological Resources

Environmental Setting

The project site is located in a sandy beach environment and does not represent any plant community. The project site's surrounding wildlife habitat types can be classified as barren, urban, and coastal wetland. Barren habitats are typically absent of vegetation, and they include open sandy beaches, rocky outcrops, and urban settings that are covered with pavement and buildings. Urban habitats include shade trees, lawns, and street strips. Coastal wetlands are a rare resource in southern California. HSB sits across Pacific Coast Highway from 114 acre Huntington Beach Wetlands which is operated by the California Department of Fish and Game. However despite the close proximity to the coastal wetlands, native plant communities do not currently exist at HSB.

SPECIAL STATUS SPECIES

To determine the sensitive plant and animal species that have the potential to occur at or near the project site, park species lists were reviewed, and a query of the California Department of Fish and Game's Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) was conducted for sensitive species within the Newport Beach 7.5-minute USGS quadrangle map. Two listed bird species are known to occur near the project site (see Table 1).

Due to the highly disturbed and developed nature of the project site, neither of the listed species is expected to occur at the project site. However, both the federally and state endangered California least tern and the federally threatened western snowy plover do nest at the southern end of HSB along the mouth of the Santa Ana River. The least tern preserve supports successful nesting activity each year, according to annual reports by State Parks. The preserve is located on the north side of the mouth of the Santa Ana River.

Table 1. Listed Species with the potential to occur at HSB

COMMON NAME	SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS
western snowy plover	*Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus*	FT
California least tern	*Sterna antillarum browni*	FE, SE

Status Codes: FE=Federally Endangered; FT=Federally Threatened

SENSITIVE NATURAL COMMUNITIES

Sensitive natural communities are those that are regionally uncommon, unusually diverse, or of special concern to local, state, and federal agencies. Elimination or substantial degradation of these communities would constitute a significant impact under CEQA. According to the CNDDB, the coastal wetlands are a sensitive natural community that exists within the Newport Beach quadrangle. However, no sensitive natural communities are found at the project site.

WETLANDS AND WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Currently, there are no Wetlands or Waters of the United States resources within the boundaries of the HSB.

3.1.5 Cultural Resources

Archeological Resources

Huntington State Beach is in the Tongva/Gabrielino ethonographic area. The Tongva were one of the most advanced cultural groups in aboriginal California. Their territory included the greater Los Angeles and Orange County areas, east to San Bernardino County, plus

the southern Channel Islands and San Nicholas Island. The Tongva practiced a hunting/gathering economy and lifestyle, but their economy over time can best be described as a maritime economy. Fishing, hunting sea mammals, and collecting shellfish on the coast were the most important subsistence economies. Their territory exceeded 1500 square miles and consisted of about 50 communities or villages. They prospered and evolved for about 4500 years until contact with the Europeans in 1769.

The Gabrielino's actually displaced the early Hokan speaking people and little is known of what happened to these early Hokan speakers in Tongva territory. An early story in Gabrielino mythology mentions how the First people or *amululuwtcum*, "they disappeared, and went off, no one knows where" (Boscana 1978:30).

Sometime late in the Millingstone Period or in the following intermediate Period, just prior to the Late Period, a new group of people Uto-Aztecans began to migrate into this area (Altshcul and Grenda 2002; Kroeber 1925, 1967R; McCawley 1996:2-3). This new group is known as the Gabrielino or Tongva. The Gabrielino's were organized, efficient, and dynamic as they quickly spread to the large geographic area mentioned earlier including many of the off-shore Islands. Somehow, even though they originated from the Great Basin area of Utah, Nevada, and California they adopted coastal technological techniques such as fishing in canoes, that allowed them to move freely across the area, traveling to the Islands and exploiting a diverse and rich resource base that supported a large population. They may have been influenced by their neighbors: Chumash or the early coastal settlers. It is also possible that many intermarried and hence joined with many of the early inhabitants (McCawley 1996:17-18, 23).

Major changes in the archeological record are evident at this time: subsistence patterns (mortars and pestles supplant manos and metates, fishing technology expands, and large projectile points are common (Erlandson 1997:7), settlement patterns change (people abandon early sites and certain coastal sites), mortuary patterns, tools kits expand (widespread use of asphaltum), and environmental changes that influenced the traditional Native American lifestyle (Dallas 1992; Erlandson 1997). The entire Period seems to revolve around subsistence and settlement diversification. Innovation occurs with asphaltum use on tools being recorded in by Wallace to a more complex hunter-gatherer lifestyle dependant on hunting, fishing, trade, and travel and occupation of the Channel Islands (Dallas 2001; 2004). Population increased on the Channel Islands and there is evidence of permanent occupation.

The Late Period reflects a diversified subsistence, concentration of population into villages, diverse tools, extensive trade networks, rituals, and dense settlements with dark middens (Moratto 1984:159-165). These villages were large community centers (some with hundreds of inhabitants) and are noted as the ethnographic villages in the mission registers. On the coast, settlements are located near estuaries or near large fresh water sources. A new economic subsystem is indicated in specialized artifact types (King 1994:115). Along with economic changes were social and political changes necessary to

pool and redistribute the food resources in order to serve the inhabitants. These changes allowed the inhabitants to take advantage of the diverse environment (including plants and animals) that they occupied. The religious system was becoming more institutionalized and powerful as the influence of Chinigchinich cult spread (King 1994). It is unknown when and why this religion began. However, he was regarded as a supreme being, who was the "maker and creator of all things" (McCawley 1996; Boscana 1978).

They impressed the early Spanish explorers as being affable, good looking, and clean (Brown 2001). The Spanish were so impressed they planned to build several missions in this territory including one in Los Angeles.

The Tongva were recruited by the Spanish into missions San Gabriel in 1771 (Hence the name Gabrielino) and San Fernando Rey in 1797 (Castillo 1978). Mission San Gabriel was always a site of Native American rebellion from the outset, due to the atrocious behavior of its soldiers. Harsh treatment, poor nutrition, and diseases decimated Native population at the missions and spread to the native villages. The traditional Gabrielino lifestyle changed in many profound ways. This lifestyle change had such a profound effect on the Native Americans; some of the padres noted, that without doctors and medicine, it was doubtful how long the natives could survive mission life (Cook 1943). They often rebelled against this oppressive lifestyle in a myriad of ways. This resistance often took the form of work slowdowns, fugitivism, feigned sickness, loss of tools, theft, infanticide, and abortions. Of those children born at the missions, three out of four died within two years if either parent had syphilis or another venereal disease (Cook 1943).

After secularization of the missions in 1834, much of the rancho lands were supposed to go to the Tongva in this area. Few of them received any lands or compensation as previously promised. Victoria Reid, the wife of Hugo Reid and a Gabrielino, received the Rancho Huerta de Cuati. A few other Indians received grants from San Gabriel, El Encino, and El Escorpion (McCawley 1996). Generally, wealthy Mexicans and soldiers inherited most of the land. These ranchos became the only source of work and existence for the Gabrielino upon the sale of mission lands. Traditional villages and ancestral lands had become ranchos and were now private property. Most surviving Tongva were employed at the ranchos as cooks, water carriers, or domestics. Outbreaks of infectious diseases further decimated the native population.

Currently there are no known archeological sites within Huntington State Beach. Sites in this area were often located on terraces overlooking major streams or creeks. Specialized food processing camps often were located amongst the sand dunes next to the ocean. These are often characterized as shell mounds or middens. These camps might have existed in the sand dunes within Huntington Beach years ago.

Historical Resources

From the start of the State Park System, the State negotiated with various landowners to acquire a strip of land that was to become Huntington State Beach. Nearly twenty years later, in 1946, the State finally succeeded. Two years later the first Ranger assigned to the Park reported that "He found nothing other than paper shacks, tents, tin cans, broken bottles and other debris in huge quantities on top of the sand dunes. . . . The area was known as 'Gospel Swamps'(Interpretive File)."

At the park dedication on May 27, 1950, State Park Commissioner, Leo Carrillo served as Master of Ceremonies. At the time, the park had two miles of paved roads to the parking areas, a capacity of 1,450 vehicles, and 10 lifeguard towers. The park grew beyond most projections as described in the following report;

> In 1966, six beach lifeguard towers were added, making a total of sixteen. A central lifeguard tower is located approximately at middle point of the beach where a duty Lifeguard is stationed during normal use periods. The top floor of this tower is 30 feet above the ground level so one is able to get a full panoramic view of the beach. The Lifeguard here is in direct contact with each of the 16 beach towers by telephone (Interpretive File).

The growing Los Angeles and Orange Counties made beaches such as Huntington State Beach popular recreation areas. The park boasted of having the highest number of visitors other than Hearst Castle. On January 9, 1976 the State Park Commission approved a General Development Plan for the park. The recommendation included the redevelopment of portions of the park, as well as new development such as park offices and lifeguard facilities. Five years later, a three phase construction plan for the park promised to replace the 1960's vintage park entrance, comfort station, and other worn down facilities (Development File).

Drawn plans for the Lifeguard Headquarters building were approved in 1983 and construction was completed in 1984 (Schuessler). State Park Landscape Architect, George Rackelmann praised the project that had been contracted with Caltrans. On March 25, 1985, he wrote:

> The structures are subtle and unobtrusive because they are about the same color and texture as the sand beach, and they are simple architectural forms . . . This project, is scarcely noticeable . . . (Development File).

This 1984 structure will be partly demolished and doubled in size to meet the current demands of its park staff. A physical survey of the site was not undertaken, only a check of historical records. With rare exception, evaluation for significance as a historic property takes place when the structure is 50 years old. This structure is only twenty years old.

Based solely on the age of the structure, it is not eligible to be reviewed as a potential historic resource. The project does not affect a historic property.

3.1.6 Geology/Soils

Topography
HSB lies near the northwestern flank of the Peninsular Ranges geomorphic province of southern California. HSB is part of the coastal plain region and is bordered by the Santa Ana Mountains, San Joaquin Hills, Puente Hills and Coyote Hills. The major feature controlling the land forms of the coastal plain is the Newport-Inglewood structural zone, which consists of a series of interrelated faults and folds. HSB is located near the southwestern onshore termination of the Newport-Inglewood structural zone. Elevation at HSB ranges from sea level to a maximum of 40 feet above sea level.

Geology/Soils

The project location lies within a seismically active southern California subject to the effects of moderate to large earthquake events (7.0-8.5) along several major faults. Earthquake events are estimated to occur between 0.5 to 37 years. The primary structure of local concern is the Newport-Inglewood structural zone which consists of several documented and inferred sub=-parallel faults in the Huntington Beach area.

Soils in the area are Sandy Loams which have a, well defined subsoil that is developed from sand rich sediment. Beach deposits is the dominant soil type. IT consists of sandy, gravelly, or cobbly coastal shores that are washed and rewashed by tidal and wave action. Localized gravelly sands appear more commonly in winter or after heavy storm waves. They consist of moderately well drained soils forming nearly level to moderately steep coastal terraces. These soils are common to marine terraces and older alluvial fans and on remnant alluvial terraces in the coastal foothills.

3.1.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

There is no known hazardous contamination at the project site and the project site is not suspected of containing any hazardous wastes, debris, or soil contamination.

3.1.8 Hydrology

HSB is located at the seaward edge of the coastal floodplain of Orange County. The land surface consists of a broad alluvial floodplain yielding to coastal tidal marshes within 8,000 feet of the ocean and although they are not present within the proposed project site they are located nearby. The nearest river, the Santa Ana River, discharges into the Pacific Ocean southeast of the State Beach.

Hydrologic characteristics for the area are closely tied to the seasonal storms and the Pacific Ocean. A high water table exists within the unit due to its proximity to the Pacific Ocean. Coastal flooding is possible in years of greater than average rainfall and large storm events.

3.1.9 Land Use & Planning

Existing land use at HSB includes recreation and daily State Beach operating activities.

3.1.10 Mineral Resources

Beach sand is the predominant mineral at HSB.

3.1.11 Noise

Vehicular traffic along Pacific Coast Highway is the primary source of noise in the project area. Additional noise comes from vehicles arriving and leaving the HSB parking lots and visitors using the beach and bike/pedestrian pathway.

3.1.12 Population and Housing

The closest community to the project site, the City of Huntington Beach, has a total population of 190,746, consisting of 79.2% white, 14.7% Hispanic, 0.8% African American, 0.6% American Indian, 9.3% Asian, 0.2%Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and 5.8% other, with a median age of 37. The area surrounding the project site has a high population density residing in primarily single-family households. Total housing units in the Huntington Beach area number 72,401 out of the 969,484 housing units within Orange County (US Census–2000).

3.1.13 Public Services

The City of Huntington Beach Police Department and CSP lifeguards/rangers provide law enforcement for HSB. The City of Huntington Beach Fire Department provides fire protection and ambulance services.

3.1.14 Recreation

Current recreational use of the HSB include: swimming, body surfing, biking, skating, and surfing the winter months. Wildlife includes seagulls and other shorebirds. The area also offers opportunities for picnickers and sunbathers

3.1.15 Transportation/Traffic

The Huntington State Beach Lifeguard Headquarters is accessible via Pacific Coast Highway. Temporary accommodations for CSP base operations may take additional parking spaces during construction however, there will be a net increase in available parking spaces at the end of construction.

3.1.16 Utilities and Service Systems

Sewer
There is currently a sewer system that serves the current Lifeguard Headquarters. Orange County Sanitation District provides this service.

Water
Water is supplied by the Orange County Water District.

Electric
There is electrical power supplied to the current Lifeguard Headquarters by Southern California Edison.

Telephone
There is currently telephone service provided to the Lifeguard Headquarters. SBC and MCI provide these services.

Gas
There is currently a gas supply that serves the Lifeguard Headquarters that is provided by Southern California Gas.

3.2 ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

PROJECT INFORMATION	
1. Project Title:	Huntington State Beach Expand Lifeguard Headquarters and Training Facility
2. Lead Agency Name & Address:	California State Parks
3. Contact Person & Phone Number:	Brenda McMillan (619) 220-5300
4. Project Location:	Huntington State Beach (HSB)
5. Project Sponsor Name & Address:	Orange Coast District California State Parks 3030 Avenida del Presidente, San Clemente, CA 92672
6. General Plan Designation:	State Beach
7. Zoning:	Beach

8. Description of Project: Renovate and Expand lifeguard headquarters and training facility at Huntington State Beach.

- Improved office and work areas for park operations.
- Improved meeting and training facility with adequate storage and support space to be completely housed within the facility.
- Lifeguard observation tower.
- Female and male locker room facilities.
- A first aid treatment area with storage.
- A garage and storage area for maintenance and lifeguard operations.
- Update Communication Equipment at Headquarters Building and between Headquarters and each Lifeguard Tower

9. Surrounding Land Uses & Setting:	Refer to Section IX, Land Use Planning in this chapter.
10. Approval Required from Other Public Agencies	None

1. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below will be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact", as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetics	☐ Agricultural Resources	☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources	☐ Cultural Resources	☐ Geology/Soils
☐ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	☐ Hydrology/Water Quality	☐ Land Use/Planning
☐ Mineral Resources	☐ Noise	☐ Population/Housing
☐ Public Services	☐ Recreation	☐ Transportation/Traffic
☐ Utilities/Service Systems	☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance	☒ None

DETERMINATION

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project **COULD NOT** have a significant effect on the environment and a **NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared. ☐

I find that, although the original scope of the proposed project **COULD** have had a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect because revisions/mitigations to the project have been made by or agreed to by the applicant. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION WILL** be prepared. ☒

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a significant effect on the environment and an **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** or its functional equivalent will be prepared. ☐

I find that the proposed project **MAY** have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated impact" on the environment. However, at least one impact has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document, pursuant to applicable legal standards, and has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis, as described in the report's attachments. An **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT** is required, but it must analyze only the impacts not sufficiently addressed in previous documents. ☐

I find that, although the proposed project could have had a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects have been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration, pursuant to applicable standards, and have been avoided or mitigated, pursuant to an earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, all impacts have been avoided or mitigated to a less-than-significant level and no further action is required. ☐

_____ September 14, 2004

Brenda McMillan — Date
Southern Service Center

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

1. A brief explanation is required for all answers, except "No Impact", that are adequately supported by the information sources cited. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact does not apply to the project being evaluated (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on general or project-specific factors (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).

2. All answers must consider the whole of the project-related effects, both direct and indirect, including off-site, cumulative, construction, and operational impacts.

3. Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, the checklist answers must indicate whether that impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate when there is sufficient evidence that a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change may occur in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the project that cannot be mitigated below a level of significance. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries, an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required.

4. A "Mitigated Negative Declaration" (Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated) applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures, prior to declaration of project approval, has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level.

5. Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR (including a General Plan) or Negative Declaration [CCR, Guidelines for the Implementation of CEQA, § 15063(c)(3)(D)]. References to an earlier analysis should:

a) Identify the earlier analysis and state where it is available for review.

b) Indicate which effects from the environmental checklist were adequately analyzed in the earlier document, pursuant to applicable legal standards, and whether these effects were adequately addressed by mitigation measures included in that analysis.

c) Describe the mitigation measures in this document that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and indicate to what extent they address site-specific conditions for this project.

6. Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate references to information sources for potential impacts into the checklist or appendix (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances, biological assessments). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should include an indication of the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7. A source list should be appended to this document. Sources used or individuals contacted should be listed in the source list and cited in the discussion.

8. Explanation(s) of each issue should identify:

a) the criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate the significance of the impact addressed by each question **and**
b) the mitigation measures, if any, prescribed to reduce the impact below the level of significance.

3.2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

The Environmental Analysis (Initial Study) Checklist was prepared to assess the impact of the proposed project's impact on the environment. The environmental setting for each topic is described in Section 3.1 above. Potential environmental impacts, identified by checklist point, are addressed in the discussion section. For each impact identified as "less than significant with mitigation," mitigation measures have been specified to reduce the impact to a less than significant level.

I. AESTHETICS

WILL THE PROJECT:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare that will adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a) The proposed project at HSB will not hinder accessibility to or block visibility of scenic areas. The benefit to the recreational experience far outweighs the effect of the visual impact. Construction activities may have a limited temporary impact on the viewshed, but obstructions will be extremely limited and brief in duration. Because the building will be enlarged there will be a minor long-term and permanent impact to the existing scenic vista. However, the building will be a renovation of an existing building and does not substantially increase the scope and scale of the existing building. Therefore, the impact from this project will be less than significant.

b) No scenic resources, natural or historical, will be damaged with implementation of the proposed project. No impact.

c) The proposed improvements will be designed to blend in with the existing landscape as much as possible. As with any construction project, there will be some temporary decrease in the visual appeal of the area immediately affected by the work being performed. However, the duration of the work in any one area will be limited and overshadowed by the improvements to recreational use that will result from the proposed project. Therefore, the impact from this project will be less than significant.

d) Lighting is not a major element of this project and will not substantially exceed what is currently in place. No impact.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES

WILL THE PROJECT*:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use?	☐	☐	☐	☒

*In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997), prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model for use in assessing impacts on agricultural and farmland.

Discussion

a-c) The HSB is not zoned for agriculture. None of the land within the parks, or areas impacted by the proposed projects is included in any of the Important Farmland categories, as delineated by the California Department of Conservation, under the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program (FMMP). This project contains no component that will have an effect on any category of California Farmland, conflict with any existing zoning for agricultural use or Williamson Act contract, or interfere with the use or result in the conversion of agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. No impact.

III. AIR QUALITY

WILL THE PROJECT*:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan or regulation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations (e.g., children, the elderly, individuals with compromised respiratory or immune systems)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	☐	☒	☐	☐

*Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied on to make these determinations.

Discussion

a) Work proposed with this project is not in conflict with and will not obstruct implementation of any applicable air quality plan for South Coast Air Basin. No impact.

b,c) Grading activities associated with construction of the proposed facilities will result in limited surface disruption and operation of diesel-powered construction equipment will emit ozone precursor emissions. Construction vehicle trips for all of the facility improvements will occur via paved roads, minimizing dust generation during truck trips.

The proposed project consists of expanding and renovating the existing lifeguard headquarters, however, the project provides for limited capacity and it is not anticipated to result in a substantial increase in visitors to the area, therefore, the project will not introduce any new air emissions associated with fossil fuel combustion or particulate matter.

The operation of the new facilities will not result in a violation of any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing, projected, or cumulative air quality violation. The proposed project will not emit air contaminants at a level that, by themselves, will violate any air quality standard, or contribute to a permanent or long-term increase in any air contaminant. However, project construction will generate short-term emissions of fugitive dust (PM_{10}) and involve the use of equipment and materials that will emit ozone precursors (i.e., reactive organic gases [ROG] and nitrogen oxides (NOx). Increased emissions of PM_{10}, ROG, and NOx could contribute to existing nonattainment conditions and interfere with achieving the projected attainment standards. Consequently, construction emissions will be considered a potentially significant short-term

adverse impact. Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

MITIGATION MEASURE AQ-1
• All trucks hauling soil, sand, or other loose materials on public roads will be covered or required to maintain at least two feet of freeboard. • Intersections of public roads will be swept daily, with water sweepers, if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets. • Exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.) subject to wind erosion will be enclosed, covered, watered twice daily, or stabilized with (non-toxic) soil binders. • All equipment engines will be maintained in good condition, in proper tune (according to manufacturer's specifications), and in compliance with all State and Federal requirements. • Grading activities will be suspended when sustained winds exceed 25 mph, instantaneous gusts exceed 35 mph, or dust from construction might obscure driver visibility on public roads.

d) As noted in the discussion above (III b,c), project construction will generate dust and equipment exhaust emissions for the duration of the project. Mitigation Measures AQ-1 above, will reduce the potential adverse impact to a less than significant level.

e) The proposed work will not result in the long-term generation of odors. Construction-related emissions might result in a short-term generation of odors, including diesel exhaust, fuel vapors, and evaporative emissions from asphalt paving materials. Some visitors to the general area might consider these odors objectionable. However, because construction activities will be short-term and odorous emissions will dissipate rapidly in the air with increased distance from the source, area visitor exposure to these odors will be extremely limited [see (d) above]. Potential odor impacts will be considered less than significant.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modification, on any species identified as a sensitive, candidate, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands, as defined by §404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a) Although HSB is home to two special status species, due to the distance from the proposed project site to the area of occupied habitat (nearly one mile), no sensitive, candidate, or special status species are expected to occur at the project site. No impact.

b) Neither riparian habitat nor sensitive natural communities are present within the project site. No impact.

c) No wetlands occur within the project site. No impact.

d) Proposed project activities would not interfere with the movement of any other native resident or migratory fish, wildlife species, or established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. No impact.

e) The proposed project would not conflict with any local policies, plans, or ordinances protecting biological resources. No impact.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WILL THE PROJECT:				
a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined in §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, pursuant to §15064.5?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

The proposed project of renovating and expanding the existing lifeguard headquarters and training facility will have no impact on cultural resources at Huntington State Beach. There are also no historic resources in the project area.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

WILL THE PROJECT:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:				
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map, issued by the State Geologist for the area, or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? (Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.)	☐	☐	☒	☐
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	☐	☐	☒	☐
iv) Landslides?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that will become unstable, as a result of the project and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997), creating substantial risks to life or properties?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste disposal systems, where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or unique geologic feature?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a) As noted in the Environmental Setting in Section 3.1, the project locations are within a seismically active region subject to the effects of moderate to large earthquake events along major faults, as defined by the State of California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey (formerly known as the Division of Mines and Geology). Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce any potential impacts to less than significant levels.

MITIGATION MEASURE GEO-1
• The design and construction of all structures and facilities included in the proposed project will comply with the 1997 UBC Zone 4 seismic requirements, Orange County Planning Department regulations, and all other applicable local, state, and federal guidelines and permitting requirements.

b) Potential exists for loss of soil during the planned grading and/or excavation. However, any grading that will take place would be minimal because the sites are mostly level. The following mitigation measures, combined with **AIR**-1, will reduce potential impacts to a less than significant level.

MITIGATION MEASURE GEO-2 EROSION
• Best Management Practices will be used during construction in all areas to control soil and surface water runoff, such as recontouring, placement of geotextiles or biodegradable reinforcement, and drainage and slope erosion control methods, as appropriate. Soil disturbance will be minimized during the rainy season by the use of temporary BMPs, including such things as covering of any stockpiled soils, silt fences, straw bales, straw or rice wattles, and sediment detention basins to prevent soil loss and siltation into streams.

c) The site is flat and lies on beach sand. The site is generally considered to be stable and there are no areas immediately adjacent to the project with the potential for lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse.

d) The soils are not considered to be expansive in the vicinity of the project as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1997). No impact.

e) The lifeguard headquarters is connected to the sewer system. No impact.

f) There are no known unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic features within the proposed project areas. Implementation of **CULT-1 (THERE IS NO CULT-1)** will reduce any potential impact to a less than significant level. No impact.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WILL THE PROJECT:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and/or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials, substances, or waste into the environment?	☐	☒	☐	☐
c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites, compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5, and, as a result, create a significant hazard to the public or environment?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport? If so, will the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Be located in the vicinity of a private airstrip? If so, will the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	☐	☐	☒	☐
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from wildland fires, including areas where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a) Construction activities will require the use of certain potentially hazardous materials, such as fuels, oils, and solvents. These materials are generally used for excavation equipment, generators, and other construction equipment and will be contained within vessels engineered for safe storage. Large quantities of these materials will not be stored at the construction site. Spills, upsets, or other construction-related accidents could result in a release of fuel or other hazardous

substances into the environment. The following mitigation measures will reduce the potential for adverse impacts from these incidents to a less than significant level.

MITIGATION MEASURE HAZMAT-1 SPILLS
• All construction equipment will be inspected for leaks immediately prior to the start of construction, and regularly inspected thereafter until equipment is removed from park premises. • The contractor(s) will prepare an emergency spill response plan prior to the start of construction and maintain a spill kit on site throughout the life of the project. This plan will include a map that delineates construction staging areas, where refueling, lubrication, and maintenance of equipment may occur. In the event of any spill or release of any chemical during construction, in any physical form on or immediately adjacent to park property, the contractor will immediately notify the appropriate CSP staff (e.g., project manager or supervisor). Emergency containment procedures will be immediately initiated to prevent contamination of the area. • Equipment will be cleaned and repaired (other than emergency repairs) outside the park boundaries. All contaminated water, sludge, spill residue, or other hazardous compounds will be disposed of outside park boundaries, at a lawfully permitted or authorized location.

b) See the VII (a) discussion above. Mitigation Measure **HAZMAT-1** will reduce the potential for adverse impacts to a less than significant level.

c) There are no schools or proposed schools within one-quarter mile of the project site. Therefore, this section does not apply to this project. No impact.

d) The HSB is not included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code §65962.5. Therefore, no impact will occur with project development. However, the contamination hazards addressed above are addressed here:

e,f) HSB is not located within a private airport land-use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public-use airport. Therefore, no impact will occur as a result of this project.

g) All construction activities associated with the project will occur within the boundaries of HSB and work will not restrict access to or block any public road. Therefore, the impact of this project on an emergency response or evacuation plan will be less than significant.

h) The project will not add any new uses that could create additional long-term or permanent increased fire risks. The man-made environment within the APE does not represent any plant community because it is barren. No impact.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

WILL THE PROJECT:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, such that there will be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells will drop to a level that will not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which will result in substantial on- or off-site erosion or siltation?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which will result in on- or off-site flooding?	☐	☐	☒	☐
e) Create or contribute runoff water which will exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted water	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Substantially degrade water quality?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map, or other flood hazard delineation map?	☐	☐	☐	☒
h) Place structures that will impede or redirect flood flows within a 100-year flood hazard area?	☐	☐	☐	☒
i) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death from flooding, including flooding resulting from the failure of a levee or dam?	☐	☐	☐	☒
j) Result in inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a) The HSB is within the jurisdiction of the Orange County Water District. The project will be in compliance with all applicable water quality standards and waste discharge requirements. (See Mitigation Measure HAZMAT 1 regarding potential impacts from accidents, spills, or upset.) Project-related grading will not create changes that would significantly alter existing drainage

patterns. Grading will be conducted in such a way as to maintain or improve drainage and will not increase flow or result in increased sedimentation in existing drainages. Ground disturbance will be minimal, further lessening the chance of any impact to surface water quality. The project scope does not include waste discharge work of any kind and will not increase or alter existing conditions. Project location, design, in combination with the mitigation measures indicated above for accidental hazardous material exposure and use of BMPs, will control soil erosion and surface water runoff and insure no water quality standards are violated. This will result in a less than significant impact to water quality and waste discharge.

b) There will be no impact to water supplies.

c) See VIII (a) discussion above. This project will not significantly alter drainage patterns in the area. The project is small with minimal grading. Grading will be designed to complement the natural drainage patterns in the area and reduce erosion from storm water. No impact.

d) See VIII (a,c) discussions above. This project will not alter drainage patterns in a manner that could result in on- or off-site flooding.

e) See VIII (c) discussion above. This project will not exceed the capacity of the existing drainage system and will not introduce polluted runoff into the existing system. No impact.

f) Project design features have not resulted in degraded water quality. No impact.

g) This project does not include the construction of housing. No impact.

h) See VIII (g) discussion above. No structures will be placed within a 100-year flood hazard area. No impact.

i) See VIII (g,h) discussion above. The project area does not lie within a 100-year floodplain.. No impact

j) The project is located on the coast and would likely be affected by seiche or tsunamis. The project will not change the likelihood of either of these events. No impact.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WILL THE PROJECT:				
a) Physically divide an established community?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Conflict with the applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of any agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to, a general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a) The project will not divide an established community because there are none existing within the boundaries of HSB. No impact.

b) This project is consistent with all applicable state and local land use plans, policies, and regulations including the General Plan adopted by the City of Huntington Beach. With certification of this Mitigated Negative Declaration, the project will be in compliance with CEQA. No impact.

c) The project will not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan. No Impact.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WILL THE PROJECT:				
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that is or will be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a) No easily retrieved mineral resources of local or regional importance have been identified within project boundaries by the Mineral Land Classification Program (administered by the California Department of Mines and Geology). (Refer to Section 3.1.10). Therefore, no loss of mineral resources will occur as a result of the proposed project. No impact.

b) The project site has not been classified or nominated as a locally important mineral resource recovery site. No impact.

XI. NOISE.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WILL THE PROJECT:				
a) Generate or expose people to noise levels in excess of standards established in a local general plan or noise ordinance, or in other applicable local, state, or federal standards?	☐	☒	☐	☐
b) Generate or expose people to excessive groundborne vibrations or groundborne noise levels?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project (above levels without the project)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project, in excess of noise levels existing without the project?	☐	☒	☐	☐
e) Be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport? If so, will the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Be in the vicinity of a private airstrip? If so, will the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a) Construction noise levels at and near the project area will fluctuate, depending on the type and number of construction vehicles operating at any given time. There are no noise-sensitive land uses located in the vicinity of the project site that will be substantially affected by the proposed construction-related activities. However, short-term increases in ambient noise levels could result in a potential increase in annoyance to passers by and those who may be recreating in the general vicinity of the project. As a result, construction-generated noise will be considered to have a potentially significant short-term impact to nearby noise-sensitive receptors (e.g., passers by). Implementation of the following mitigation measures will reduce those potential impacts to a less than significant level.

Mitigation Measure Noise 1
• Construction activities will be limited to daylight hours; alterations in this schedule will be made to address overriding construction considerations or worker safety. No work will take place on weekends or holidays. • Internal combustion engines used for any purpose at the job site will be equipped with a muffler of a type recommended by the manufacturer. Equipment and trucks used for construction will utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., engine enclosures, acoustically-attenuating shields or shrouds, intake silencers, ducts, etc.) whenever feasible and necessary.

- Stationary noise sources and staging areas will be located as far from sensitive receptors as possible. If they must be located near sensitive receptors, stationary noise sources will be muffled to the extent feasible and/or, where practicable, enclosed within temporary sheds.

b) Construction activity will not involve the use of explosives, pile driving, or other intensive construction techniques that could generate significant ground vibration or noise. Minor vibration immediately adjacent to grading equipment will only be generated on a short-term basis. Therefore, groundborne vibration or noise generated by the project will have a less than significant impact.

c) Once the proposed project is completed, all related construction noise will disappear. Nothing within the scope of the proposed project will result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels.

d) See XI (a) discussion above. Mitigated to a less than significant impact.

e, f) The project area is not located within a private airport land-use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public-use airport. Therefore, no impact will occur as a result of this project.

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

WILL THE PROJECT:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a) Work proposed by this project is designed primarily to meet the needs of State Park employees to provide public services. The project will not have a housing component and all work will take place within the confines of the park boundaries, with no additions or changes to the existing local infrastructure. Therefore, it will have no impact on population growth in the area.

b) As noted in the XII (a) discussion above, the project will have no housing component and will neither modify nor displace any existing housing. No impact.

c) As noted in the XII (a) discussion above, the project will have no housing component and will displace no one, either temporarily or permanently. No impact.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WILL THE PROJECT:				
a) Result in significant environmental impacts from construction associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:	☐	☐	☐	☒
Fire protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Police protection?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Schools?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Parks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Other public facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a) There will be no need to create or alter any government facilities with implementation of this project. Alterations to the area as a result of the proposed project will be minor, designed to provide improved lifeguard headquarters facilities. As the project is designed to meet the needs of the current user population, the level of required services is expected to remain relatively static. Any impact on services will be temporary and nothing in the project scope will contribute to the need for an increase in the level of public services.

XIV. RECREATION

WILL THE PROJECT:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities, such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility will occur or be accelerated?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion

a,b) The project will occur in a heavily used recreation area. Their will be minor inconveniences to the visiting public during construction, however, there will be an enhanced recreational benefit after construction. No project component will substantially increase visitation or demands to this or any other park or recreational facility in the area. Less than significant impact.

XV. TRANSPORATION/TRAFFIC

WILL THE PROJECT:	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
a) Cause a substantial increase in traffic, in relation to existing traffic and the capacity of the street system (i.e., a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Exceed, individually or cumulatively, the level of service standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Cause a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location, that results in substantial safety risks?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Contain a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or a dangerous intersection) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment) that will substantially increase hazards?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Result in inadequate emergency access?	☐	☐	☒	☐
f) Result in inadequate parking capacity?	☐	☐	☒	☐
g) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a) A significant increase in visitation to the area of HSB is not anticipated as a result of the proposed project. All construction activities associated with the project will occur within the boundaries of the park and work will not restrict access to or block any public road. The addition of several vehicles entering and leaving during daylight hours will not constitute a substantial increase in traffic volume or result in congestion at the park entrances, or restrict the public's access to adjacent areas. Additionally, most heavy equipment will be stored on park property for the duration of the project, further reducing the traffic impacts. Therefore, the project will result in a less than significant impact.

b) Per the XV (a) discussion above, the impact on congestion resulting from the additional construction vehicles to normal traffic, , will be minimal and have no impact on the acceptable Level Of Service for this area.

c) The HSB is not located within a private airport land-use plan or within two miles of a public airport or public-use airport. Nothing in the proposed project will in any way affect or change existing air traffic patterns in the area. Therefore, no impact will occur as a result of this project.

d) As noted in the XV (a) discussion above, all construction activities associated with the project will occur within the boundaries of the HSB, and work will not restrict access to or block any public road. There are no incompatible uses related to this proposed project. No impact.

e) All construction activities associated with the project will occur within the boundaries of the HSB and work will not restrict access to or block any public road. Therefore, the impact of this project on emergency access or response will be less than significant.

f) Project construction will generate a temporary demand for construction worker vehicle parking. This parking demand will not be substantial and will likely be accommodated in the construction staging areas. Temporary accommodations for base operations may take additional parking spaces during construction, however, there will be a net increase in the number of available parking spaces at the end of construction. Less than significant impact.

g) There are no policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation that apply to the project or project area. The project will have no impact.

XVI. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WILL THE PROJECT:				
a) Exceed wastewater treatment restrictions or standards of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	☐	☐	☐	☒
b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Will the construction of these facilities cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒
c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities?	☐	☐	☐	☒
Will the construction of these facilities cause significant environmental effects?	☐	☐	☐	☒
d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources or are new or expanded entitlements needed?	☐	☐	☐	☒
e) Result in a determination, by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project, that it has adequate capacity to service the project's anticipated demand, in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	☐	☐	☐	☒
f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?	☐	☐	☐	☒
g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations as they relate to solid waste?	☐	☐	☐	☒

Discussion

a) The project is within the jurisdiction of the Orange County Water District (do they do wastewater also?). The project will be in compliance with all applicable water quality standards and waste discharge requirements. (See Mitigation Measure **HAZMAT**-1 regarding potential impacts from accidents, spills, or upset.) No impact.

b) The proposed project will add restrooms, however, the addition of these restrooms will have less than a significant impact. It contains no elements that will have an impact on public water or wastewater treatment facilities. No impact.

c) Project grading is designed to maintain or enhance existing natural drainage patterns to avoid storm water erosion. And alteration to overall drainage patterns will be minimal. Therefore, the

proposed project will have no impact on existing storm water drainage facilities or require the construction of new facilities.

d) Current water supplies will adequately serve the proposed facilities even with minimal additional demands associated with the proposed construction, and projected future use. No impact.

e) The proposed facilities would have the ability to handle future demands as the capacity of the facilities is limited and restricted to seasonal use. Installation of vault toilets?? will not increase wastewater treatment demands. No impact.

d) The proposed work will increase the Park's solid waste disposal needs very little over current park uses and will be in compliance with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations, therefore, this project will have no impact.

e) This project will comply with Federal, state and local statues and regulations as they relate to solid waste. No impact would result from this project.

CHAPTER 4
MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE.

	POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT WITH MITIGATION	LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	NO IMPACT
WILL THE PROJECT:				
a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal?	☐	☐	☒	☐
b) Have the potential to eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?	☐	☐	☒	☐
c) Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, other current projects, and probably future projects?)	☐	☐	☒	☐
d) Have environmental effects that will cause substantial adverse effects on humans, either directly or indirectly?	☐	☐	☒	☐

Discussion

a) The proposed project was evaluated for potential significant adverse impacts to the natural environment. Because the project area serves as the current lifeguard headquarters, there is a high degree of disturbance of the natural environment in the area. Project-related impacts are focused in disturbed areas and would not affect any native plant community. Impacts to sensitive plant or animal species are not anticipated as none were observed on the project sites.

b) The proposed project will not eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory by disturbing potential archaeological features and resources. No archeological sites were found in the vicinity of the current lifeguard station. The site has been completely disturbed from previous development. There are also no historic resources in the project area.

c) CSP often has other smaller maintenance programs and rehabilitation projects planned for a park unit. Because the mission of HSB is to protect and preserve the natural resources of the area, while making them available for public enjoyment, there may be numerous maintenance and restoration projects on-going at any time. Ongoing maintenance/rehabilitation activities are designed to protect and enhance areas of public use within Parks and typically do not have a negative effect on the environment, either individually or cumulatively. No additional projects,

other than routine maintenance, are planned for the proposed project area in the foreseeable future. Moreover, impacts from other environmental issues addressed in this evaluation do not overlap in such a way as to result in cumulative impacts that are greater than the sum of the parts. Less than significant impact.

d) Most project-related environmental effects have been determined to pose a less than significant impact on humans. However, possible impacts from construction accidents (Hazards and Hazardous Waste), as well as noise, though temporary in nature, have the potential to result in significant adverse effects on humans. These potentially significant adverse impacts will be reduced to a less than significant level when all mitigation measures incorporated into this project are fully implemented.

CHAPTER 5
PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The following alternatives were considered for this project:

Alternative 1 Expand and reconfigure existing lifeguard training facility and park lifeguard headquarters:

This alternative will provide the additional space needed by the park staff and training staff to effectively carry out their duties, ultimately providing a safer, more enjoyable experience for the visitor's to this park as well as the many other parks that rely on this facility to train their lifeguards. This alternative would provide a cohesive, well thought out and attractive building. This alternative will result in some increase in support costs in the form of utilities and housekeeping of existing but expanding program and facility.

Alternative 2 Phase the expansion and renovations to the existing structure.

This alternative would be to phase the expansion and renovations to the existing structure. While ultimately achieving the same final result as Alternative No. 1 this would prolong the down time created by the construction and will increase the overall cost of the project by requiring project startup costs to be incurred two or more times. The inefficiencies caused by inadequate space for the park staff and crowded training facilities will remain through the project's final completion. The continued use of inadequate space and the multiple disruptions of the facilities availability will compromise the overall quality of service and safety California State Parks and park staff are able to provide to the public.

Alternative 3 Move programs and services to another location outside the park.

This alternative would move essential park facilities to an off-site location. All of the functions housed in the facility are most appropriately located at the current site. Park operations staff need to have quick and easy access to park facilities and visitors to provide services and maintain facilities. The training program needs to be located in a state park with direct beach access. The existing facility is located in the most logical place for both functions. Size and efficiency are the key issues.

Alternative 4 (No project)

This would not provide the safety enhancements, training facility or improved operational efficiencies that the new lifeguard and training facility would provide.

CHAPTER 6
SUMMARY OF MITIGATION MEASURES

The following mitigation measures will be implemented by CSP as part of the HSB Lifeguard Replacement project. (can you just double check that what we have listed earlier matches what is listed below? Thanks)

AIR QUALITY

MITIGATION MEASURES AIR-1

- All trucks hauling soil, sand, or other loose materials on public roads will be covered or required to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.
- Intersections of public roads will be swept daily, with water sweepers, if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.
- Exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.) subject to wind erosion will be enclosed, covered, watered twice daily, or stabilized with (non-toxic) soil binders.
- All equipment engines will be maintained in good condition, in proper tune (according to manufacturer's specifications), and in compliance with all state and federal requirements.
- Excavation and grading activities will be suspended when sustained winds exceed 25 mph, instantaneous gusts exceed 35 mph, or dust from construction might obscure driver visibility on public roads.
- Soil stabilization and revegetation will be used in those areas where vegetation was damaged or destroyed during grading, immediately after completion of work. The project manager/contractor will consult with a CSP-qualified resource ecologist to determine the appropriate type and level of revegetation necessary for each area.

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

MITIGATION MEASURES BIO-1

- Not applicable.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

MITIGATION MEASURES CULT-1

Not applicable.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

MITIGATION MEASURES GEO-1

- The design and construction of all structures and facilities included in the proposed project will comply with the 1997 UBC Zone 4 seismic requirements, Orange County Planning Department regulations, and all other applicable local, state, and federal guidelines and permitting requirements.

MITIGATION MEASURES GEO-2

- If any grading will occur, appropriate measures will be taken to control soil and surface water runoff, including recontouring, placement of geotextiles or biodegradable reinforcement, and drainage and slope erosion control methods, as appropriate. If storms are anticipated during construction, "winterizing" will occur, including the covering of any stockpiled soils and the use of temporary erosion control methods to protect disturbed soil. Other temporary erosion control measures will be used as needed and may include the use of silt fences, straw bales, weed-free straw or rice wattles, and sediment detention basins to prevent soil loss.

HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

MITIGATION MEASURES HAZMAT-1

- All equipment will be inspected for leaks immediately prior to the start of construction, and regularly inspected thereafter until equipment is removed from park premises.
- The contractor(s) will prepare an emergency spill response plan prior to the start of construction and maintain a spill kit on site throughout the life of the project. This plan will include a map that delineates construction staging areas, where refueling, lubrication, and maintenance of equipment may occur. In the event of any spill or release of any chemical during construction, in any physical form on or immediately adjacent to park wetlands, or on park property, the contractor will immediately notify the appropriate CSP staff (e.g., project manager or supervisor). Emergency containment procedures will be immediately initiated to prevent contamination of wetlands.
- Equipment will be cleaned and repaired (other than emergency repairs) outside the park boundaries. All contaminated water, sludge, spill residue, or other hazardous compounds will be disposed of outside park boundaries, at a lawfully permitted or authorized location.
- A safety plan will be developed and reviewed by all project staff prior to the start of any work. Job site characteristics to reduce the potential for fire will be included.
- Spark arrestors or turbo-charging (which eliminates sparks in exhaust) and fire extinguishers will be required for all heavy equipment.
- Construction crews will be required to park vehicles away from flammable material, such as dry grass and brush. At the end of each workday, heavy equipment will be parked over mineral soil, asphalt, or concrete to reduce the chance of fire.
- Park staff will be required to have a State Park radio on site, which allows direct contact to City of Huntington Beach Fire Department and centralized dispatch center, to facilitate the rapid dispatch of control crews and equipment in case of a fire. Fire suppression equipment will also be available on park grounds.

NOISE

MITIGATION MEASURES NOISE-1

- Construction activities will be generally limited to daylight hours; alterations in this schedule will be made to address overriding construction considerations or worker safety. No work will take place on weekends or holidays.
- Internal combustion engines used for any purpose at the job site will be equipped with a muffler of a type recommended by the manufacturer. Equipment and trucks used for construction will utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., engine enclosures,

acoustically-attenuating shields or shrouds, intake silencers, ducts, etc.) whenever feasible and necessary.

- Stationary noise sources and staging areas will be located as far from sensitive receptors as possible. If they must be located near sensitive receptors, stationary noise sources will be muffled to the extent feasible and/or, where practicable, enclosed within temporary sheds.

CHAPTER 7
REFERENCES / DOCUMENT PREPARATION

MATERIALS REFERENCED

Altshcul, Jeffrey H. and Donn Grenda. 2002. Islanders and Mainlanders: Prehistoric Context for the Southern California Bight. SRI Press. Tuscon Arizona.

Barrett Consulting Group. July 30, 1987. Resource Inventory for the State Beach General Plan, prepared for the City of Huntington Beach. Costa Mesa, California.

Boscana, Father Geronimo. 1978. Chinigchinich. Translated by Alfred Robinson and annotations by John P. Harrington. Malki Museum, Banning CA.

Brown, Alan K. 2001. A Description of Distant Roads, Original Journals of the First Expedition into California, 1769-1770 by Juan Crespi. Edited and Translated by Alan K. Brown. San Diego State University, San Diego, CA.

California Air Resources Board (CARB). Area Designations Maps/State and National (updated May 13, 2002). http://www.arb.ca.gov/desig/adm/adm.htm

California State Parks. Old Files, Southern Service Center.

1980, January. Castillo, Edward D. 1978. The Impact of Euro-American Exploration and Settlement, In *California, Vol. 8 of the* Handbook of North American Indians. Smithsonian. Washington D.C.

City of Huntington Beach, http://ErSys.com

Cook, Sherburne F. 1978. Historical Demography, in California. Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 8. Smithsonian Institution.

_____1943. The Conflict between the California Indians and White Civilization I: The Indian versus the Spanish Mission. Ibero-Americana 21. Berkeley, Calif.

Dallas Jr., Herb. 2004. ReEvaluating the Early Millingstone Complex in Coastal Southern California: VEN-1, A Case Study. Proceedings For the Society of California Archaeology, Vol. 17. pp151-161. Chico, CA.

_____2001. Revisiting the Little Sycamore Site: An Early Period Millingstone Site Along the Santa Monica Coastline. Proceedings of the Society for California Archaeology, Vol. 14. Fresno.

_____1992. Hunters and Gatherers at CA-SLO-977, San Luis Obispo County, California. In Archives of California Prehistory, number 37. Archaeological Investigations of Some Significant Sites on the Central Coast of California. Pages 1-25. Coyote Press, Salinas, CA.

Department of Parks and Recreation. April 1976. Huntington State Beach Resource Management Plan and General Development Plan,.

Erlandson, Jon. 1997. The Middle Holocene along the California Coast, in Archaeology of the California Coast during the Middle Holocene. Edited by Jon M. Erlandson and Michael A. Glassow. Institute of Archaeology, UCLA. Los Angeles.

Huntington State Beach Redevelopment Plan. Final Environmental Impact Report. January 1980, Huntington Beach Development. Old Files, Southern Service Center.

Huntington Beach Development. Old Files, Southern Service Center.

King, Chester. 1994. Prehistoric Native American Cultural Sites in the Santa Monica Mountains. Ms prepared by the Topanga Anthropological Consultants for the Santa Monica Mountains and Seashore Foundation.

Kroeber, Alfred. 1967. Handbook of the Indians of California. California Book Company, Ltd. Berkeley, CA.

McCawley, William. 2002. A Tale of Two Cultures: the Chumash and the Gabrielino, in *Islanders and Mainlanders*, SRI Press.

_____1996. *The First Angelinos: The Gabrielino Indians of Los Angeles*. Malki Museum Press/Ballena Press Cooperative. Banning/Novato

Moratto, Michael. 1984. *California Archaeology*. Academic Press. Florida.

Raab, Mark and Andy Yatsko. 1990. Prehistoric human ecology of Quinquina, A research design for archeological studies of San Clemente Island, Southern Califonria. Pacific Coast Archaeological Society Quarterly 26 (2/3):10-37.

U.S. Census Bureau, http://factfindger.census.gov

Wallace , William et al. 1956. The Little Sycamore Shellmound, Ventura County, California. In Contributions to California Archaeolgy Number 2. Archaeological Research Associates, Los Angeles, CA.

Personal Communications

Schuessler, Amy Phone Conversation. July 27, 2004. State Park Architect.

REPORT PREPARATION

Amy Schuessler
Architect
Southern Service Center

Suzy Lahitte
Project Manager
Southern Service Center

Jeanice Davis
Landscape Architect
Southern Service Center

Brenda McMillan
Associate Resource Ecologist
Southern Service Center

Ron Saenz
Associate Park and
Recreation Specialist
Environmental Coordinator
Southern Service Center

Herb Dallas
Associate State Park Archeologist
Southern Service Center

Mike Bonk
Research Analyst I (GIS)
Southern Service Center

Alexa Clausen
State Historian II
Southern Service Center

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

APPENDIX A
MAPS/FIGURES

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLYLEFT BLANK

APPENDIX B
PROJECT DESIGN GRAPHICS